



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/810,634 | 03/29/2004 | Ju Hyun Kim | 2336-256 | 9586 |

7590 02/13/2006

LOWE HAUPTMAN GILMAN & BERNER, LLP
Suite 310
1700 Diagonal Road
Alexandria, VA 22314

| | |
|--------------------|--------------|
| EXAMINER | |
| TOLEDO, FERNANDO L | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2823 | |

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/810,634 | KIM ET AL. |
| | Examiner Fernando L. Toledo | Art Unit 2823 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 December 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 15-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 11-14 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. (U. S. Patent 6,583,032 B1) in view of Yamaguchi (U. S. Patent 6,916,725 B2) and Chen et al. (U. S. Patent 6,221,751 B1).

3. Ishikawa, in the U. S. Patent 6,583,032 B1; figures 1 – 11, and related text discloses (a) grinding a rear surface of a wafer so that the wafer has a designated thickness; (b) lapping (polishing) the rear surface of the ground wafer so that the wafer has a designated thickness; (c) etching the rear surface of the lapped (polished) wafer so that the wafer has a uniform thickness; and (d) scribing the rear surface of the dry-etched wafer (Column 6; Lines 8 – 23).

Ishikawa does not disclose dry etching the rear surface. Ishikawa discloses spin etching. However, Yamaguchi, in the U. S. Patent 6,916,725 B2; figures 1(a) – 8(d) and related text, discloses that spin etching could be either wet or dry etching (Column 7, Lines 30 – 32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to dry etch the rear surface of the wafer in Ishikawa, since as taught by Yamaguchi, spin etching can be either dry etching or wet etching since they are equivalent in the art.

Ishikawa does not disclose wherein the wafer is a sapphire wafer. However, Chen, in the U. S. Patent 6,221,751 B1; figures 1 – 37 and related text, discloses for semiconductor chips the wafer can be made out of sapphire, quartz, silicon, gallium arsenide, etc. (Column 24, Lines 9 – 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the wafer of Ishikawa made out of sapphire, since as taught by Chan, sapphire is a conventional material for wafer and it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the base of its suitability, for its intended use involves only ordinary skill in the art. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. See MPEP §2144.07.

4. Claims 2 – 5 and 7 – 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishikawa in view of Yamaguchi and Chan as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Wolf and Tauber (Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era Volume 1: Process Technology).

5. In re claims 2 and 7, Ishikawa discloses etching. Ishikawa does not disclose wherein the step (c) is performed by an RIE method. However, Wolf and Tauber, in the textbook, Silicon Processing for the VLSI Era Volume 1: Process Technology page 541 discloses that RIE etching has low excitation energy, directional and selective (Figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use RIE method as the etching method of Ishikawa, since, as taught by Wolf and Tauber, RIE has low excitation energy, it is directional and is selective.

6. In re claims 3 and 8, Ishikawa in view of Chen and further in view of Wolf, does not teach, wherein the step (c) is performed for 50 seconds or more.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to preform the etching of 50 seconds or more, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. In addition, the selection of time is obvious because it is a matter of determining optimum process conditions by routine experimentation with a limited number of species of result effective variables. These claims are *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges or a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill or art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1995) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious). Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed time or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen time or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen time is critical. *In re Woodruf*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

7. In re claims 4 and 9, Ishikawa in view of Chen and further in view of Wolf and Tauber does not disclose that the sapphire wafer is dry-etched by 800Å or more.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to etch 800 Å or more, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. In addition, the selection of thickness is obvious because it is a matter of determining optimum process conditions by routine experimentation with a limited number of species of result effective variables. These claims are *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges or a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill or art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1995) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious). Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed thickness or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen thickness or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen thickness is critical. *In re Woodruf*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

8. In re claims 5 and 10, Ishikawa in view of Chen and further in view of Wolf and Tauber does not disclose wherein the voltage bias of an RF is of at most 26W.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a RF bias voltage of at most 26 W, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. In addition, the selection of voltage is obvious because it is a matter of determining optimum process conditions by routine experimentation with a limited number of species of result effective variables. These claims are *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996)(claimed ranges or a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill or art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1995) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious). Note that the specification contains no disclosure of either the critical nature of the claimed voltage or any unexpected results arising therefrom. Where patentability is said to be based upon particular chosen voltage or upon another variable recited in a claim, the Applicant must show that the chosen voltage is critical. *In re Woodruf*, 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 11 – 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
10. Claims 15 – 18 are allowed over the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fernando L. Toledo whose telephone number is 571-272-1867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 7am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2823

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Fernando L. Toledo
Examiner
Art Unit 2823

flt
7 February 2006